

REMARKS:

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, this application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Summary of Amendments to Claims

The Applicant has amended claim 6 to more clearly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 6-10 remain pending in the application.

Response to Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacPhee et al. (US 4,757,763) in view of Schmitt et al. (US 6,432,211).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art references (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on an applicant's disclosure in the specification. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of MacPhee in view of Schmitt, fails to teach or suggest, either expressly or inherently, all the limitations of the claims.

The method of the present invention, as defined in amended claim 6, comprises the steps of: (1) providing a supply roll with a blanket pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity; (2) providing the pre-treated blanket from the supply roll; (3) applying a cleaning medium for solving soil to the soiled surface; (4) placing the pre-treated blanket into operating contact with the soiled surface by a pressing means to create a soiled blanket; and (5) rolling up the soiled blanket to form a roll thereby removing the soil from the soiled surface.

MacPhee teaches a method for cleaning the surface of a cylinder by treating a cleaning cloth with a solvent immediately before moving the cleaning cloth into contact with the surface of the cylinder to be cleaned. MacPhee does not teach the steps of providing a supply roll with a blanket pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity and providing the pre-treated blanket from the supply roll, nor does it teach the step of applying a cleaning medium to the soiled surface.

Schmitt teaches a method for cleaning the surface of cylinder by applying a cleaning medium directly to the surface of the rotating cylinder to be cleaned, instead of treating the cleaning cloth with a solvent, and then moving the dry cleaning cloth into contact with the surface to be cleaned. Schmitt does not teach the steps of providing a supply roll with a blanket pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity and providing the pre-treated blanket from the supply roll either.

The two prior art references, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The pending claims recite the steps of providing a supply roll with a blanket pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity and providing the pre-treated blanket from the supply roll, which steps simplify the cleaning procedure and the device required for the procedure. MacPhee does not teach or suggest the claim limitations, nor is the information taught or suggested by Schmitt. Modifying MacPhee in view of Schmitt, or vice versa, would not yield the Applicant's invention, which has unobvious advantages that it eliminates the need for complex cleaning procedures and devices required in MacPhee's system and it is very effective in removing heavy soiling from the surface of the cylinder to be cleaned.

Based on the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is unobvious over the applied prior art. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and accordingly, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place the case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendment or correction be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue.

Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees, including any extension and/or excess claim fees, any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to Goodwin Procter LLP Deposit Account No. 06-0923.

Respectfully submitted for Applicant,



Eva Tan (Reg. No. 46,406)
Goodwin Procter L.L.P.
103 Eisenhower Parkway
Roseland, NJ 07068
(973) 992-1990 Ext. 7904